

a1
centered by the inner wall of the outer one of said end portions of said housing and said cap, and the ring having a peripheral portion which exceeds the inner diameter of the housing for engaging said supporting surface, and wherein

a gap remains between mutually facing surfaces of said end portions of the housing and the cap when said housing, cap and tube are assembled with said ring abutting said engaging portion of the cap and the peripheral portion of said ring abutting said supporting surface of said housing.--

✓
Claim 4, line 1, change "1" to --6--.

✓
Claim 5, line 1, change "1" to --6--.

REMARKS qh

In response to the Office Action, claims 1-3 have been rewritten as new independent claim 6, and claims 4 and 5 have been amended to now depend from claim 6. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks which follow.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, due to language appearing in claims 1 and 3. In the drafting of new claim 6, those objections were kept in mind and claim 6 is believed to be free from informalities.

The Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 6 includes all of the features of claims 1-3, and is accordingly believed to be in condition for formal allowance.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), noting that the "play" between the housing and the ring supporting surface as called for in former claim 3 is not illustrated. Although the word "play" is synonymous with "gap", the latter term has been used in the drafting of claim 6. When

Serial No. 08/371,219


the housing, cap and tube are assembled as shown in the application drawing, a gap remains between the shoulder 6 of the housing and the edge 8 of the cap. The Examiner's attention is referred to page 8, lines 21-26, and the paragraph beginning in line 20 on page 9 and continuing to line 2 on page 10. Although "gap" is synonymous with "play" (see page 6, lines 1-13), the term "gap" has been used to be consistent with the detailed description.

Original claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under § 102(b), and claim 5 was rejected under § 103. However, in view of the indicated allowability of new claim 6, no specific discussion of the cited prior art is believed necessary.

As amended, the application is believed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. In the event any minor matters remain, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number appearing below so that allowance of the application can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

August 23, 1995
Date


Donald D. Jeffery
Reg. No. 19,980

FOLEY & LARDNER
Suite 500
3000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-5109
(202) 672-5300

- 3 -

